

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/551,976 | YAMAMOTO ET AL. | |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| KRISTIN BIANCHI | 1626 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) KRISTIN BIANCHI. (3) _____.

(2) Joseph C. Suhadolnik. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10/09/2008

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

22 and 27-35

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed Applicant's attorney that the compound claims (22-26) were allowable (i.e. no prior art was found) and that the only amendment needed for these claims was to fix a few comma errors in claim 22. Examiner also informed Applicant's attorney that claims 27-35 were not necessarily allowable as written because of the preamble "an EL device." Examiner explained that the preamble "an EL device" is very broad as written and could involve complications which she and her art unit are not familiar with. Applicant's attorney and the examiner agreed on cancelling claims 27 and 28 and amending claims 29-35 to read on the composition and to delete the preamble "an EL device."